

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW HAMPSHIRE**

Daniel E. Hall, Plaintiff,
v.
Twitter Inc., Defendant.

Case No. 1:20-cv-536-SE

**PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO REPLY TO TWITTER, INC.'S
OBJECTION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO STRIKE TWITTER'S
MOTION TO DISMISS**

Plaintiff, pursuant to Local Rule 7.1(e)(2), moves, for leave to file a reply to Defendant's "Objection" [Doc. 106] to the Plaintiff's [Doc. 100] Motion to Strike Twitters Motion to Dismiss at [Doc. 3] and MOL at [Doc. 3.1].

1. Plaintiff seeks leave to file a reply to rebut Twitter's outright misrepresentations describing the facts and arguments of Plaintiffs Motion within its Objection.

2. Contrary to Twitters Objection, a motion to strike has never been answered by this Court in this case. Plaintiff filed a [Doc. 14] Motion to Strike which was never answered by the Court. Twitter eludes to "other then-pending motions" in an attempt to steer the Court into believing a motion to strike has already been decided.

3. The [Doc. 3] Motion and [Doc. 3.1] MOL are illegal, prohibited, part of the fraud upon the Court which would detract from the dignity of the court, are

scandalous and non-conforming and would be scandalous for the Court to accept and should be stricken by the Clerk or Court as authorized under LR 5.2 and LR 77.2. and under Fed.R.Civ.P. 12.

4. Plaintiff does not file a memorandum of law herewith as all authority in support of this motion is cited herein.

Wherefore, Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court allow Plaintiff to reply to Twitters objections.

Respectfully,

/s/ Daniel E. Hall
Plaintiff, aka, Sensa Verogna
SensaVerogna@gmail.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Daniel E. Hall, certify that on this date I electronically filed the foregoing document using the CM/ECF system, which sent notification of such filing to the Defendants counsel of record, Jonathan M. Eck and Julie E. Schwartz, Esq., and Indraneel Sur, Lead Attorney for U.S. DOJ.

/s/Daniel E. Hall